

**Performance Evaluation of the  
Institute for a New South Africa**

(USAID/SA Grant Agreement No. 674 -0312-G-SS-5017-01)

**Evaluation Report**

**Submitted to:**

**USAID/South Africa**

**Submitted by:**

**Keith Cattell  
Bruce Boaden**

**Department of Construction Economics & Management  
University of Cape Town**

**2 March 1999**

**Macro International, Inc.  
USAID/SA Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) Project,**

## **Executive Summary**

### **Purpose of**

- Evaluation:**
- i) to compare the Institute for a New South Africa's progress to date with its stated goals and those of the SO6 team
  - ii) to synthesise the achievements of INSA with respect to SO6 RP#3 In particular and to SO6 in general

### **Methodology:**

- i) review of all documentation
- ii) interviews with INSA and USAID officials
- iii) review of written comments of interns

### **Background:**

INSA is a non-profit training and educational organisation based in Berkeley, USA with an office in South Africa. Since 1987 INSA has promoted linkages between US cities and disadvantaged communities in South Africa. It obtained USAID's support in 1995 at a time when local authority councils were being democratically elected for the first time and there was a major need for previously disadvantaged people to acquire skills in local government matters.

### **USAID's Funding**

**Approach:** USAID grant of \$300 000 made in 1995 for two years. A further \$50 000 issued later and the agreement extended to March 1998. The project is now complete.

### **Purpose of**

**Agreement:** To provide South African municipal officials with access to US expertise in housing, community/urban development and municipal administration through the Public Administration Exchange Program (PAEP).

**Findings:** A total of 62 South African municipal officials and councillors spent two to three months with host cities in the USA over the three years of the project. The feedback of the interns was positive with respect to the PAEP program in general, to the scope of experience gained, contacts made, and relevance to the South African situation. Problems with the program included poor co-ordination of logistics in the USA, staffing problems mainly in the South African office, difficulty of finding host cities in the US, difficulty of obtaining feedback from interns, and lack of funds.

## **Conformance with Agreement Objectives:**

Good conformance with respect to overall purpose of the Agreement but more specific objectives only partially achieved.

## **Conclusions:**

- C INSA was successful in implementing the Public Administration Exchange Program although not all the objectives of the Agreement were achieved;
- C The massive difference in wealth between the two countries makes the US approach to local governance questionable as a model for a developing country such as South Africa; danger of creating of unrealistic expectations in the minds of interns;
- C Program in USA too unfocussed with insufficient emphasis on housing matters;
- C Host cities needed to be more informed about the background situation from which their interns came and to develop an appropriate programme around this;
- C The role of the South African office was underplayed resulting in too little input and initiative coming from this end;
- C The program in many ways outgrew its original purpose which was founded on the situation prevailing in 1995 prior to the first democratic local authority elections in South Africa;
- C The ambassadorial role of the interns not acknowledged and planned for accordingly; this often left them in an awkward situation.

## **Recommendations**

The project in its original format is no longer appropriate. There is, however, still a critical demand for previously disadvantaged people with housing related skills from local authorities which now have a much larger role to play in housing provision than before. It is recommended that USAID, through its SO6 initiative, support a specified number of education and training institutions in South Africa which are presently active in this area and which lack financial support.

## **Synthesis:**

This program indirectly met the requirements of SO6 RP#3 and of SO6 generally in that capacity was developed around housing and other urban

management issues.

---

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction . . . . .	1
1.1	Evaluation Purpose . . . . .	1
1.2	Scope of Work . . . . .	1
1.3	Methodology . . . . .	2
2.	Background . . . . .	2
3.	USAID's Funding Approach . . . . .	3
3.1	Purpose of the Agreement . . . . .	3
3.2	Agreement Objectives . . . . .	4
4.	Findings . . . . .	5
4.1	INSA's Achievements . . . . .	5
4.1.1	The Public Administration Exchange Program (PAEP): an Overview . . . . .	5
4.1.2	Implementation of PAEP . . . . .	6
4.1.3	Problems Experienced in the PAEP Program . . . . .	7
4.2	Interns' Feedback: Summary and Assessment . . . . .	8
4.3	Conformance with Agreement Objectives . . . . .	9
5.	Conclusions and Lessons Learned . . . . .	10
6.	Recommendations . . . . .	12
7.	Synthesis: Results Contribution to SO6 RP#3 and SO6 . . . . .	13
7.1	SO6 Results Package #3 . . . . .	13
7.2	SO6 Goal . . . . .	14
	ANNEX: INSA's Comments on the first Draft of the Evaluation Report . . . . .	15

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 Evaluation Purpose**

This report documents the results of an evaluation of USAID's grant to the Institute for a New South Africa (INSA) The main objective of the evaluation is to compare INSA's progress to date relative to its stated goals and to those of the SO6 team.

A second purpose is to synthesise the achievements of INSA with respect to SO6 RP#3 and to SO6 in general.

### **1.2 Scope of Work**

In terms of our agreement with Macro International Inc. we were commissioned to conduct a performance evaluation of the Institute for a New South Africa, the scope of work being as follows:

- C review relevant information sources and interview representatives from Grantee organisations with a view to establishing the aims and objectives of the Grant and how these link with USAID's SO6 goals;
- C assess the current status of the Grant in terms of individual accomplishments and in comparison with the intended results agreed on by the Grantee and USAID;
- C identify and discuss the rationale for any transformation or changes that have occurred in the organisation;
- C determine and show whether or not results have been achieved and goals met, and whether this was done within the agreed upon Grant arrangements;
- C for all performance levels, assess the rate of progress/non-progress;
- C for training-related components of the performance assessment, conduct a trainee impact assessment survey, addressing the following questions:
  - a) what was the trainees' perception of the training experience?
  - b) whether trainees are using the experience gained, and how?
  - c) whether the training has impacted on the professional life of trainees, and how?
  - d) what concrete examples can be provided of things learned?

e) what do trainees envisage will be the long-term benefits of training received?

- C indicate whether there were any unanticipated positive or negative consequences and how these impacted on the program;
- C highlight lessons learned and identify best practices;
- C make suggestions and recommendations regarding the overall performance and future activities of the Grantee and USAID;
- C if necessary, debrief Grantees and organisations prior to departure.

### **1.3 Methodology**

*Document review:* a careful study of the main agreement and amendment was undertaken in order to establish the main purpose and objectives of the Grant. In addition, USAID documentation with respect to SO6 RP#3 and SO6 were studied.

*Interview with Key Players:* interviews were held in Pretoria with the INSA Field Co-ordinator, Rebecca Thamaga. She was responsible for managing the organisation's operations from September 1996 to March 1998 when the USAID grant expired. Two meetings were held with Russell Hawkins who is the USAID/SA manager in charge of this grant.

*Written comments of interns:* these were obtained from a sample of weekly reports, three final reports and two responses from a questionnaire recently administered by the assessors. Within the time available it was impossible to contact and directly interview persons who have benefited from this program since 1995.

Another methodological issue concerns the fact that this project was to a large extent controlled and operated by persons in the Berkeley office with whom it has not been possible to communicate although some documentation from the US is available.

## **2. Background**

The problem originally addressed in this USAID project was that, under

apartheid, the black local authorities that were in charge of administering the townships were entirely discredited and powerless institutions. The democratic elections for new local governments were scheduled to occur in November 1995 (soon after the Agreement date). It was written in the Agreement at the time: "Gaining access to elected positions in local government is only the first step in transforming the divided and unequal apartheid municipalities. The municipal bureaucracy itself, currently staffed by predominantly white conservatives, will have to be transformed. Major programs in public housing, urban development, basic service delivery, economic development, and job creation must be designed and implemented at local level. Future black elected officials and city employees will have tremendous responsibilities, and yet they have little experience and exposure to issues that will face them in local government. ....Additional efforts are severely needed to increase the exposure of newly elected South African municipal officials to the realities of urban government. Through hands-on, practical exposure to U.S. local government best management practices, future South African municipal officials will be better able to meet the service delivery needs of historically disenfranchised urban communities".

- I NSA is a non-profit training and educational organisation based in Berkeley, USA. Since 1987 INSA has promoted linkages between US cities and disadvantaged communities in South Africa - referred to as Sister Community Linkages (SCLs). Initially INSA was partially funded by the United States Information Agency. The first sister SCL was established between Berkeley and the SA community of Oukasie in 1988. These linkages have been extended considerably since then. INSA's main activity is its Public Administration Exchange Program (PAEP) under which South African community leaders (mainly city or town councillors) serve three month (later reduced to two month) internships in US municipal governments. This programme is administered partially from Pretoria and partially from Berkeley in the USA. The PAEP is geared towards providing local government training for SA officials or councillors in local government.

### **3. USAID's Funding Approach**

A USAID grant of \$350 000 was made in August 1995 and expired in March 1997; this was later extended by one year to March 1998 and may therefore be regarded as complete although a final report is still outstanding.

#### **3.1 Purpose of the Agreement**

The main purpose of the Agreement was to provide South African municipal officials (later councillors) with access to US expertise in the fields of:

- C housing
- C community/urban development
- C municipal administration.

Technical assistance would be provided through attachments to US municipalities. Workshops and seminars would be conducted in SA municipalities by US local government experts.

It is to be noted that some difficulties were experienced with the agreement documentation by the assessors. For example, in terms of the original agreement dated August 1995, this program was described in Attachment 2 as a Strategic Objective 3 program specifically with SO3 objectives (Section IC of Program Description); an Action Memo dated June 1995, also refers to this program meeting the objectives of SO3; another, undated, Attachment 2 is different in wording to the Attachment 2 attached to the Agreement - this other Attachment 2 refers specifically to "the urgent need for public administration skills", and not in any way to housing or shelter. This project has, however, been evaluated specifically as a SO6 project with Attachment 2 attached to the original agreement as the valid attachment. The assessors were assured by Russell Hawkins that this was indeed an SO6 project and not SO3.

### **3.2 Agreement Objectives** (Adapted from Amendment No. 2.)

#### *Operational:*

- i) establish attachment programs for historically disadvantaged South Africans with appropriate US municipalities;
- ii) US-based consultants to provide short-term technical assistance to future SA local government officials;
- iii) organise workshops and seminars; to be done by INSA and participating organisations;
- iv) ensure on-going networking between SA internship participants and their municipal sponsors in the USA.

#### *Administrative:*

- i) reporting required: quarterly financial report; semi-annual progress reports; and a final report;
- ii) counterpart funding contribution of \$255 672 is to be provided;



- iii) a project implementation committee, made up of U.S. and South African representatives, is to be established which will approve a recruitment and selection process, assist in the development of strategies to help facilitate training for municipal officials, and to monitor and evaluate implementation progress.

## **4. Findings**

### **4.1 INSA's Achievements**

All INSA's achievements are connected with the Public Administration Exchange Program which has been the focus of INSA's activities since USAID first provided financial support in 1995.

#### **4.1.1 The Public Administration Exchange Program (PAEP): an Overview**

Described below is the original view of the PAEP as set out in INSA documentation. This was written at the time prior to the first democratic municipal elections when prospective interns were not necessarily elected councillors or officials. Since this was written, most municipalities now have a larger proportion of previously disadvantaged officials and councillors with most interns being councillors.

The PAEP is intended to provide interns (or fellows) from South Africa with a comprehensive view of policy development, financial management and public participation at the local level. They will observe and participate in the daily operations of local and regional governments with respect to issues such as economic development, housing and community development, public works and infrastructure, education, financing and budget management, health and social services, transportation, and human resources.

The intent of the internship is not to provide specific technical training, but an experience that will expose the intern to policy-level issues and political processes. Such an experience will allow the intern to compare and contrast the American system to South Africa's and to provide a basis for useful exchange of ideas and information. Interns will be able to scrutinise and explore a range of issues concerning city governance. In addition to their formal internships, the interns will meet with academics, community organisations and NGOs to learn how these different forces interact, conflict and co-operate with local governments.

Interns will be selected in consultation with provincial ministers, transitional local councils, SANCO and regional political parties. All participants will be either active in local government negotiations, involved in the TLC or targeted by local communities to represent them in the new local government. Participants will be civic leaders, potential councillors or probable managers or administrators in the new local authority.

The internship will begin with a three-day informational, logistical and cultural orientation in Johannesburg. Interns will also be provided with an introduction to the American system of government. After arriving in their particular city, participants will be placed in a key department of a municipality and paired with a knowledgeable mentor. At the end of the three-month (later two-month) internship, the interns will convene for a five-day workshop in the USA to evaluate and share their experiences. Three months after getting back to South Africa a further workshop will be convened.

#### **4.1.2 Implementation of PAEP**

Since 1995 a total of 62 interns have been successfully processed by the PAEP program through three cycles; 12 in 1995, 16 in 1996 and 34 in 1997. This entailed the following main functions being carried out by the INSA offices in South Africa and America since 1995:

##### *South Africa Office:*

- C contact local councils, provincial leadership and others in order to solicit candidates for participation in the program;
- C Selection of candidates: extensive interviews held throughout the country;
- C develop and implement orientation workshops; this includes recruiting trainers and consultants who take part in the program and preparing materials;
- C organise and implement follow-up workshops for returning interns<sup>1</sup> where, *inter alia*, the following are discussed: evaluation of their experiences, ways to apply what they have learnt, and to problem-solve with respect to current problems facing local councils; workshops are facilitated by an independent NGO, Planning Action Group (PLANACT);
- C maintaining on-going monitoring and communication with interns before and after their attachment, organising visas, reporting to the Berkeley

---

<sup>1</sup>In one case a follow-up workshop was not held due to a lack of funds

- office and to funders;
- C dealing with staffing matters - particularly in 1996 when a new full-time field co-ordinator needed to be found and appointed; prior to this the SA side of the operation was handled on a part-time basis.

#### *USA Office:*

- C negotiate with city liaison officers to develop the attachment program with their municipalities and community organisations; finding new cities with which to work;
- C organise logistics of the US-stay with respect to each cycle;
- C follow up meetings and continuous communication with interns and city mentors;
- C develop and control a budget for the South African side of the operation;
- C making adjustments to the program based on experience gained and feedback from earlier cycles of interns;
- C administer the final evaluation questionnaires;
- C dealing with staffing matters locally and in SA;
- C support, in the form of US personnel, for SA orientation and follow-up workshops.

#### **4.1.3 Problems Experienced in the PAEP Program**

- i. In the view of the current Field Co-ordinator in South Africa, the co-ordination of logistics in the US was poorly organised by US personnel. This view is confirmed by the feedback of some of the interns. It is to be noted, however, that much of the organising done in the US relied on unpaid volunteers. This situation was "aggravated by poor support and follow-on communication by the US office".
- ii. Staffing problems in the SA office. In June 1996 the part-time field co-ordinator, Myesha Jenkins resigned and was eventually replaced by Mangakane Rebecca Thamaga on a full-time basis. Ms. Thamaga was appointed in September 1996 which left her only about eighteen months to become familiar with the program and to make a make an impact upon its *modus operandi* and its appropriateness in the new South Africa.

- iii. There was an on-going need to find new host cities in the US. There were very few cities which were prepared to participate in two cycles in a row. A contributing factor was that the interest shown by cities declined with the fall of apartheid.
- iv. Difficulties experienced in obtaining good feedback information from interns - particularly with respect to the completion of assessment forms.
- v. Lack of further funding from USAID meant that the program had to end effectively in February 1998.

## 4.2 Interns' Feedback: Summary and Assessment

The information from this section was taken from the following sources: weekly report back questionnaires (30), quarterly reports (1), questionnaires administered in December 1998 by assessors - only three were received (all from 1997 interns) from a total of sixteen distributed, and three formal reports prepared by four interns. While it is accepted that this is a limited sample, the assessors believe that it does give an accurate reflection of the views of the interns; only when a view is repeated more than once is it reported on. Lack of time and the time of year made it impossible for the assessors to contact former interneers - many of whom are no longer contactable.

- C *Overall assessment by interns:* they were very positive about the program and appeared to have very few problems. Most of them wrote very enthusiastically, and very eloquently, about their experiences. Reading of the final reports prepared by interns demonstrates that a fair understanding of the manner in which the host municipality operates was obtained.
- C *Scope of experience gained:* interns were exposed to a wide range of experiences, some directly related to local government activities and others of a broader more social nature, all of which should have long term benefits for them; they also appear to have been kept very busy with very full itineraries. The local government exposure was in the areas of housing, transportation, urban development, city administration including budgeting and financial control, planning, and environmental matters. Their American hosts - both municipal and domestic - made every effort to ensure that the interns were exposed to as much as possible while they were there; in some instances they also played almost a publicity role for their hosts.

This breadth of exposure, while good in many ways, was at the expense of interns picking up more applied skills by addressing fewer issues in more depth. One of the aims of the program, however, is to give interns this broad experience.

- C *Contacts made:* interns made contact with a large number of people and institutions; in many cases they met and were entertained by very senior people in local government and in the community; it has not been possible to ascertain whether or not any of these contacts have been maintained.
- C *Complaints:* the few complaints made concerned the lack of organisation when first arriving in the USA, having to move home too frequently, lack of communication with other interns while in the US, the desire to have wives present, and insufficient information provided about the US before leaving SA. There was a need for host municipalities to have a better knowledge of the interns' interests before they arrived.
- C *Applicability of experience to the South African situation:* there was strong consensus amongst interns on the relevance of what they were learning to problems encountered back in SA, although they did acknowledge that there were significant differences such as the housing problem being of a much smaller scale - with, in fact, there being a housing surplus in one city. The predominance of timber construction methods and the use of mobile homes surprised some. The fact that the mayor was elected by popular vote interested some interns. Many interns commented on the wealth differential of the two countries and the particularly low unemployment rate in the USA.
- C *Ambassador role of interns:* a number of interns made the point that they were constantly questioned on issues and problems in South Africa and found themselves having to portray a positive image. It is not clear to what degree interns were equipped to do this.
- C *Other comments:* Some were impressed with the apparent openness of local government and the degree to which citizens became involved in public decision-making. Others commented on the labour-saving ways of doing things. Without exception, interns were happy with their domestic hosts even though these changed too frequently. There were only three formal reports available from internees although these were requested from all of them by INSA.

A cause of concern of the assessors is that two written reports by interns had some text where the one was copied word for word from the other. The two

reports referred to are one from Hennie van Wyk on Diego dated 22 Feb. 1997 (p.7) and one from L. A. Scheepers and T. M. Mfene on St Paul dated 19 March 1997 (p.4).

#### 4.3 Conformance with Agreement Objectives

The overall purpose of the Agreement was partially achieved, *i.e.*, "to provide South African municipal officials and councillors with access to US expertise in the fields of housing, community/urban development and municipal administration". Very often, however, a great deal of time was spent on matters not directly related to these issues. The non-technical benefits such as those of self-confidence, the ability to relate to others, etc., although not measurable in this case, clearly would have had a major impact on many of the interns which would contribute to their later development and, as such, to the upliftment of the previously disadvantaged population. A more detailed study would need to be undertaken to unravel the overall real benefits of the attachment program.

With respect to the specific Agreement objectives (see Section 3.2):

- C *Establish attachment programs:* this was achieved with a reasonable number of HDP benefiting from the program (62) in the three years of its operation and with the amount of funding available;
- C *US-based consultants to provide short-term technical assistance:* according to the Field Co-ordinator, Rebecca Thamaga, this did not happen;
- C *Organise workshops and seminars:* this was done satisfactorily both in SA and the USA. In 1998, however, lack of funds made it impossible to run a follow-up workshop;
- C *Ensure on-going networking between interns and municipal sponsors in the USA:* this was encouraged by INSA with some success;
- C *Reporting:* this was done satisfactorily. A final report, however, has not yet been produced. USAID has been requested to provide funds to do a final audit and to write the final report;
- C *Counterpart funding:* this was provided only in kind through the activities of volunteers in the USA; INSA was not expected to provide any extra funding for the project;

- c. *Formation of a Project Implementation Committee:* this was not done; instead a local interviewing panel was formed which worked satisfactorily.

## **5. Conclusions and Lessons Learned**

- a. While INSA has been relatively successful in implementing the Public Administration Exchange Programme, it has not fully complied with all the provisions as set out in the Agreement. E.g. the aspect of short-term technical assistance to be made available to SA local government officials by US-based consultants was not carried out and the envisaged Implementation Committee was never established. INSA has also failed to produce a final report and the assessors have not come across any evidence that the organisation has monitored the impact of its program as per USAID's requirements. (USAID's cover letter with the revised grant agreement, dated 21 September 1996, provided the following guidelines on monitoring: "INSA will report on not only "numbers of trained municipal officials", but, more importantly, on essential follow-on questions including: what performance changes have been initiated by the officials in their institutions ? What performance changes have been initiated by the officials' institutions ? How do these changes contribute to USAID's strategic objectives ?").
- b. This aside, INSA has succeeded in meeting the main purpose of the Grant which was to provide municipal officials and councillors with access to US expertise in the fields of housing, community/urban development and municipal administration. However, this exposure took place at a very broad level and was not designed around previously identified problems that the interns were faced with in their every day jobs. The potential impact of the program could have been enhanced if the program had been designed around job and/or organizational performance issues. Although the program did include a pre-internship orientation, this pre-training preparation does not appear to have been sufficient to allow the interns to develop an adequately receptive attitude towards learning and enable them to identify questions themselves, in collaboration with their superiors, before embarking on the trip. Although follow-up activities to the training were implemented by INSA to some extent, a more systematic and prolonged implementation (and monitoring) of follow-on activities upon the interns' return (e.g. formally organised networking, repeat workshops, technical assistance, preparation of a trip report and discussion thereof with interns' supervisors etc.) would probably have generated more tangible benefits from the program.

- c. Although most interns found the experience very relevant to the problems that they encountered at home, there is clearly a massive difference in economic wealth between the two countries, which impacts on the level of resources available at local government level. This makes the US approach to local governance questionable as a model for a developing country such as South Africa and it reduces the potential advantage to be gained from “twinning” SA and USA cities. One intern commented that a low-income house in the municipality that he was living in, was considered to be three bedrooms and a double garage. Much of what interns experienced in the US is just not possible in the SA context and there was always the danger of interns obtaining unrealistic perceptions and expectations of what was possible in their own municipalities. Collaboration with and exposure to Latin American cities might have been more appropriate and relevant.
- d. The exposure of interns to housing issues in the US was limited and not always relevant. In this regard the PAEP program was too unfocussed in giving interns a broad overview of US experience rather than concentrating on specific problems and issues facing their respective municipalities back in SA. The host municipalities needed to be more informed about the background situation from which their interns came and to develop a program around this.
- e. The program was centrally managed by the US office in Berkeley with only one full-time person responsible for the SA part of the operation. While this had the advantage of reducing overheads, it prevented any strong initiatives developing through the South African office. This was exacerbated by the fact that the South African Field Co-ordinator was left with a very short period in which to develop the organisation further. Having only one South African on the board of INSA was another limiting factor.
- f. The program in South Africa in many ways outgrew its original purpose which was founded on the situation prevailing immediately prior to the 1995 local authority elections i.e., inexperienced, unskilled, previously disadvantaged people having to start playing a role in local government. There was at the time a desperate need to provide some support for these people. Although such a need still exists, there are now training programs in place for people such as these to acquire the necessary skills.
- g. The ambassadorial role of the interns needed to be clearly acknowledged and planned for accordingly. Interns often found themselves having to provide detailed information about their country for which they were ill prepared. Furthermore, the cultural shock experienced by many interns resulted in a lot of time having to be spent by US staff in 'acclimatising' these interns.



## **6. Recommendations**

Since this project is now completed the question arises as to whether or not it should be reinstated as a USAID project and, if so, what the new format should be.

As discussed in Section 5, it is the feeling of the assessors that the project in its previous format is no longer entirely appropriate and that a new format is required which will meet the present needs around specific job and organizational performance issues and related skills. In terms of the Local Authorities Act, local authorities are now required to play a far more important role in the provision of housing in partnership with private sector institutions. In addition, there have been some fundamental changes in government policy with respect to social housing as reflected in the new Rental Bill, the establishment of the Social Housing Foundation and the Peoples' Housing Process which require that local authorities play a major role.

Given this background, it is clear that local authorities will need people with housing skills - particularly in the areas of finance, project management and community empowerment. At the present time there is a dearth of such skills throughout the country and, indeed, throughout Africa. Housing as a developmental process rather than as only a product is little understood. Educational institutions and some NGOs have started meeting this need but only on a very limited scale, mainly due to the absence of financial support.

It is the view of the assessors that a USAID-funded SO6 project which supports a selected number of educational and training programmes would have a major impact on housing provision in this country. This support could be direct or through bursaries to previously disadvantaged local authority employees and could be co-ordinated through a local INSA office. This funding should preferably be used to gain access to developmental expertise elsewhere in the world, e.g. Latin America.

## **7. Synthesis: Results Contribution to SO6 RP#3 and SO6**

### **7.1 SO6 Results Package #3: Support for CBOs and NGOs**

Intermediate Result # 6.3: *"Increased Non-credit forms of assistance to the HDP for obtaining access to shelter and urban services".*

IR-level indicator; '*number of HDP households that receive services through non-credit assistance*'.

It is noted that the Results Package description does not corroborate fully with the required Intermediate Result nor with the IR-level indicator. As regards the IR-level indicator; '*number of HDP households that receive services through non-credit assistance*', INSA's conformance with this requirement could not be assessed as the organisation has not collected data on performance changes brought about at the individual and/or organizational level as a result of the training, nor has INSA monitored to what extent these changes (if any) have resulted in enhancing HDP households' access to services. INSA's achievement of facilitating the internship of 62 previously disadvantaged persons in US local governments *may* result in some persons gaining access to houses and urban services, albeit probably in an indirect manner and in the long term only.

**7.2 SO6 Goal: *Improved access to environmentally sustainable shelter and urban services for the historically disadvantaged population***

Interns obtained considerable exposure to environmental matters while in the US. This exposure *may* have equipped them to pay more attention to these issues in the performance of their work. It could thus be argued that INSA *may*, albeit in an indirect manner, have contributed to that aspect of USAID's goal. Likewise, other aspects of the goal *may* have been achieved, again probably only in an indirect manner. The SO6 housing strategy is 'designed to support the national effort to adequately house the disadvantaged *majority*'. To this end, INSA's activities *may* have had a long term impact in providing access to shelter and services for the HDP through providing local authority officials with expertise in urban management matters. Again, this impact (if any) would have been made in an indirect manner.

## **ANNEX**

### **INSA's Comments on the Draft Evaluation Report** (see hard copy)

INSA's comments on the first draft of the evaluation report (which was issued on 31/12/1998) are enclosed for the record. The consultants have not been able to respond to all the grantee's comments. This relates partly to the limited time available to them to conduct and finalize the evaluation. Also, and more importantly, there would have

been a need for further discussion (negotiation) with the grantee over some of the points raised. There may also have been instances where the consultants decided to differ in opinion with the grantee.